5.3.06

(2) (4)

Hon`ble S.B.

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BILASPUR (C.G.)

Single Bench

WRIT PETITION NO. 2523 / 2006

PETITIONER:

Smt. Malti Bhadre, W/o Late Shri Mohan Bhadre, Aged about 38 years, Caste Bhatra R/o Panarapara, Behind Mata Mandir, Jagdalpur, District Bastar , Chhattisgarh

VERSUS

RESPONDENTS:

1. State of Chhattisgarh Through the Secretary, Department of Home Affairs, Mantralaya, D.K.S. Bhawan , Raipur, (C.G.)

2. The Inspector General of Police, (Administration), Police Head Quarter, Raipur, Chhattisgarh

3. The Suprintendent of Police, Jagdalpur, District Bastar, Chhattisgarh

4. State of Madhya Pradesh Through the Secretary General Administration Department, Vallabh Bhawan, Bhopal, (M.P.)

5. Union of India, Through the Secretary, Department of Personnel & Training, 3rd Floor, Lok Nayak Bhawan , Khan Market , New Delhi

21/9/06
Affd/06
R.C. No. ..... Presented by Shri ...Adv. Delangan... dated 19/4/06

RECEIVED-COPY
19/4/06
CLERK to A. G. BILASPUR

~~3~~ 5

WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226/227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA FOR ISSUENCE OF WRIT IN THE NATURE OF MANDAMUS, PROHIBTION, CERTIORARI, AND ANY OTHER WRITS, DIRECTIONS OR ORDERS.

The petitioner named above respectfully submits the particulars of the petition as under: -

(20)

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

आदेश पत्रक

मामला क्रमांक WP 2523/06 सन् 200

विरुद्ध

आदेश का दिनांक आदेश क्रमांक सहित	आदेश हस्ताक्षर सहित	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश

11.5.2006

Shri A. Devangan, Advocate for the petitioner.

Shri Satish Gupta, Dy. Govt.Adv. for the State.

Heard.

The main grievance raised by the petitioner in this petition is that her husband, who was working as Constable in the Police Department died in harness in the year 1996, therefore, she had applied for appointment on compassionate ground, but nothing has been heard. Thereafter, the petitioner had made representation to the respondents and the Superintendent of Police, Jagdalpur recommended the case of petitioner for consideration vide Annexure P-2 and P-3, even then her case is not being considered for compassionate appointment.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner has already made representation to the respondent, which is not being decided, therefore, the petitioner may be allowed to make a fresh representation to respondent No.2 and respondent No.2 be directed to decide the same, to which learned State counsel has no objection.

The prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioner appears to be fair, just and reasonable, therefore, the petitioner is allowed to make a detailed representation to respondent No.2 within a period of two weeks from today and in turn respondent No.2 shall decide the representation of the petitioner and pass appropriate orders considering the grievances of the petitioner in accordance with policy decision of the State Government regarding compassionate appointment within a period a three months from the date of receipt of the representation.

With the direction aforesaid, the petition stands disposed of.

Consequently, M.(W.)P. No.1892/06 also stands disposed of.

Certified copy as per rules.

Sd/-
L.C. Bhadoo
Judge